An Analysis of Farsight's "ET PsyOps"

Jake Muller

"Quiet Stream" (2017) original painting by author

© Jake Muller, 2025.
The copyright is just a reminder not to use this article for commercial gain without written permission (email: jmullerhome@gmail.com). It is free to share.

Abbotsford, BC, Canada: Beachview Creations

An Analysis of Farsight's "ET PsyOps"

Introduction

Farsight[1] is an important social organization that provides valuable information about extraterrestrials (ETs) and other items[2] by its highly competent remote viewers (RVs). I watch their free videos but I am not a paid subscriber. One Farsight Trailer video that I watched pertained to "ET PsyOps"[3] about which I will offer some comments[4].

Before starting my analysis I want to make sure that readers understand that I have great respect for Courtney Brown and all the remote viewers of Farsight. My analysis should not be construed as a personal attack or taken to be disparaging in any way of these excellent people. I'm basically analysing one of their ideas, their use of the PsyOps concept to understand one group of Zeta ("Grey") ETs.

After watching Farsight's video I did a search on the use of PsyOp. I discovered that the idea of a PsyOp was first used in 1945 by the U.S. military when messages of surrender were sent to Japan that offered "humane treatment for enemy personnel" if they stopped fighting against the U.S. forces[5]. From there I did a search of its use by the US military and discovered that PsyOps had been abandoned in 2011 and replaced by the term "military information support operations"[6] (MISO, yes, just like the name of the popular Japanese soup). In the Canadian military, I live in Canada, the concept is still retained though it has become part of the general division of "influence activities" (IA)[7]. These military organizations have moved on from their use of PsyOps, no doubt to avoid the negative connotations involved in referring to their operations as such.

With these ideas in mind, I will present some shortcomings created by Farsight's use of PsyOps. These include the ahistorical adoption of the PsyOp concept, the interpretation of this concept beyond its definition, and lastly, the weaknesses created in their use of it to the ET channeled history. Given these problems, I suggest that they may wish to rethink or omit this concept in this area of their work.

1. Farsight's Ahistorical Adoption of the Meaning of a PsyOp

---

[1] I use Farsight as a shortcut to refer to the people and the presenter of the video of this social organization.
[2] See The Farsight Institute website: https://farsight.org/
[3] Jeaneé, 2025 Jan 24.
[4] My analysis is based on an approach called institutional galactic ethnography (see Muller, 2024, pp. 20-24). By extension this would also include a universe and multiverse ethnography that would simply be called institutional universe ethnography or institutional multiverse ethnography.
[5] Curtis, 1989.
[6] Military Information Support Operations Supplement To The Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan. 2011 Sep 30.
[7] Psychological Operations. 2021 Mar 1.

The first problem that I present concerns Farsight's definition of a psychological operation. The definition that the host of the Farsight Trailer video presents is given around the 18 - 19 second timestamp:

> "Google AI, a PSYOP (sic) is a psychological operation, which is a military and political activity that aims to influence the emotions and behaviors of individuals, organizations, and governments."

One thing that is omitted here is that this PsyOp definition does not provide us with a link to a source or sources to help us understand its meaning in a social context. Recall that the idea of a PsyOp was first used in 1945 by the U.S. military when messages of surrender were sent to Japan that offered "humane treatment for enemy personnel" to stop fighting against the U.S. forces[8]. Farsight's adopted definition is generally consistent with this concept being a military activity where the US military directed its psychological operation against the Japanese military and its people to surrender. What we have here is one side that created the PsyOp that is directed at another receiving and responding side.

The idea of a political activity has been added to that of a military operation. There is no reference or illustration for the addition of a political activity which makes it simply an assertion with no supporting information.

There are additional problems, however, with Farsight's adopted definition. We do not know who created this concept and its definition. What is stated is that it is from "Google AI". There is no person or historical connection that is mentioned or referred to in this definition, just "Google AI". The means by which this concept is provided is through a transnational corporation, Google, and their AI. The historical military context has been omitted. We do not know if the corporate Google AI changed, modified, altered, or amalgamated another PsyOp definition or meanings. That history is not included. The PsyOp concept and definition are thus an abstraction without any ties to other people and the historical context involved in creating its meaning. They are presented to us as corporate, free-floating, universal ideas.

Having presented us with a general concept, anyone can now use PsyOp and direct it at anyone. This is what Farsight does as I'll point out. They adopt the universal PsyOp concept and meaning unquestionably and interpret it as they wish.

2. Interpretations Beyond the Presented PsyOp Definition

To understand how Farsight expands on the PsyOp definition that they use, the following statement is by their presenter at the 35 - 56 second timestamp:

> "Anyone trying to influence the public in any way, shape, or form is a PSYOP. Farsight is a PSYOP. Yep. If you are public in any way whatsoever, and if you are trying to shift the society in any way by changing the way people think, you are a PSYOP."

[8] Curtis, 1989.

Some of the differences between Farsight's original definition and the presenter's interpretation of a PsyOp include the following.

Recall that their definition highlights military and political activity of unknown people. This has been expanded by the presenter to include "anyone". Now, Farsight asserts that you don't have to be military or political. Anyone can create a PsyOp, be it corporations, governments, even the people at Farsight themselves. Their interpretation does not rule out anyone starting a PsyOp who wants to influence the public.

The other part to their expanded meaning is that there is no longer an organizational congruence between those who started a PsyOp and those on the receiving end. That is, it's not a military PsyOp directed at another military. The receiver of the PsyOp has been expanded to "the public". Essentially, anyone seeking to influence the public, such as a corporation or government, is undertaking a PsyOp. The PsyOp no longer has to target a similar or relevant organization.

If anyone can start a PsyOp and direct it to the general public, Farsight neglects to include social class in their understanding and carrying out a PsyOp. Clearly, wealthy and powerful elites are able to wield much more influence on the general public than ordinary people in society. A transnational corporation, for instance, would have far more resources to undertake a PsyOp "in any way, shape or form" than Farsight.

When social class relations are added to an understanding of a PsyOp, we have different impacts on the public. For instance, a corporation that creates a PsyOp would have a much greater possibility to have people in society to think and act the way that the corporation wants them to than a smaller organization like Farsight. Typically, this would be stated as a corporation's "media campaign" and not as a PsyOp given the general negative overtone of using PsyOp.

Farsight's expanded interpretation of a PsyOp raises a number of problems whose impact on the public are not considered. To this may be added the misapplication of this concept to their chosen example.

3. Farsight's Misapplication of PsyOp to Their Examples

The kind of understanding that Farsight presents about a PsyOp also creates problems in applying it to their chosen examples of the interaction between channelers and ETs. I highlight some of the missing links in the ET PsyOp relation with Farsight. As well, I reveal that Farsight's method of using the PsyOp concept creates problems in understanding their examples, especially what is and is not part of a PsyOp.

Farsight's examples include the interaction between 2 channelers, Lyssa Royal and Darryl Anka, who channel two ETs, Germaine and Bashar, respectively, and then analyse the impact that these 2 ETs have on the general public. In addition, Farsight refers to the book by Royal and Priest, called *Visitors from Within*, in particular chapter one. I will also refer to some parts of this book that Farsight overlooked in applying the PsyOp concept.

In order to understand how Farsight has misapplied the PsyOp concept, I start by presenting how Lyssa Royal describes the start of her channeling in her co-authored book with Keith Priest.

1) Farsight Ignores the Actual Start of Their ET PsyOp

The first point that I present is that Farsight ignores the actual start of the PsyOp, which begins with the channeler Lyssa Royal.

Royal describes how her channeling starts: “Lyssa puts herself in a meditative state in which her personality disconnects from her normal perception of reality.”[9] She states that her personality detaches from what she usually perceives. The issue of “disconnecting” is taken up and described later. What is significant at present is that the channeler, Royal, begins the interaction with an ET entity. To state the obvious, without Royal, or any other channeler, ETs would not be able to convey their PsyOp information to us or to Farsight. This point is overlooked by Farsight.

To recap, the channelers begin the interaction with the ET entities and are thus entwined with them. The ETs wouldn’t be able to present their PsyOp if it were not for the channelers.

2) Farsight Absolves the Involvement of the Channelers in the ET PsyOp

Even though the channelers start the ET PsyOp, Farsight absolves them from any involvement in it. This is how Farsight presents their reasoning. They begin by asserting that the channelers are not part of the PsyOp. This assertion is expressed around the 8 minute and 15 second timestamp (and following). Farsight maintains that “when a human channel lets such an entity control their mind and body, they're not in a position to properly vet these entities”. Again, around the 9 minute timestamp they state that “the human channels who work with Bashar and Germane are innocent of everything.” Because the channelers are not in control of their mind and body, they can’t be part of the ET entity responsible for the PsyOp. Farsight simply declares that the channelers are blameless.

A contrary view to Farsight’s claim that a channeler loses control over their mind and body by ETs is actually expressed by Royal. Here is how Royal and Priest describe the process when a conscious link is established with Royal: “Another consciousness links energetically and telepathically with her brain and then uses it as a translation device for the concepts discussed.”[10] The ETs establish a link with Royal’s brain which allows their information to be translated to those listening. In addition, the authors are very clear that the ETs do not control Royal’s “mind and body”. From their book, “In no way is she ‘taken over’ by another entity. It is entirely a cooperative process between Lyssa and the entity. It can be discontinued at any time by the choice of the channel.”[11]

The channeler disagrees with Farsight that the ET entity controls their mind. Instead, the ET response to the channeler is stated to be a cooperative process with the ET entity. That the

[9] Royal & Keith, 1992, p. xiv.
[10] Royal & Keith, 1992, p. xiv.
[11] Royal & Keith, 1992, p. xiv.

channeler can end the interaction at any time also indicates that their mind is not controlled by the ETs as Farsight claims.

The idea of an ET vetting process is also part of Farsight's stance. The presumption here is that the channeler needs to screen any entities that seek to enter their brain in order to keep out "the bad" and only let "the good" ETs enter. Here too, Royal presents a different stance than Farsight. That is, Royal has no intention of involving any assessment process to keep out the bad ETs. She and Priest refer to the ETs as "visitors" and state their case as follows: "The 'visitors' are here by invitation, the abductors are here by invitation and are our guests".[12] There is no intention by Royal and Priest to do any screening or vetting of the ETs even though they engage in Earth[13] human abductions. Royal and Priest overlook these ET galactic crimes. Indeed, these authors chastise others that invoke what they call the "evil alien" syndrome, ("negative aliens, reptilian invasions and similar stories"). They consider any reference to ETs being evil as "a distraction that often masks the significance of humanity's encounter with the visitors"[14].

As a result, it isn't the case that the channelers are not able to vet the ETs to determine if they are good or bad towards the public. These channelers aren't interested in any screening of ETs at all. Apparently, for them, all channeled ETs provide something important to us, even the ones that abduct humans against their will. The information provided by any ETs overrides any of their nefarious activities. All information provided is deemed to be significant to us humans, even if it might be false.

As we can see, particularly for Royal and Priest, the channelers consider themselves part of whatever knowledge the ETs present. If they don't care about the harm to Earth humans, then they are clearly collaborators with the ET PsyOp and not just innocent channelers.

3) Farsight Ignores that Royal and Priests' Book Disseminates the ET History

We, the general public, obtain the knowledge provided by the ET entities, such as their history, through the channelers, like Royal. How it is obtained is that while Royal is "in a trance, the entities through Lyssa are questioned by co-author Keith Priest and/or various other individuals attending the private or public gathering"[15]. Both the questions and the answers are transcribed and edited only for "grammatical or structural reasons"[16]. After the session is over, Royal "retains only a dreamlike memory of what has transpired"[17]. We are told that there is no influence by the channeler or the authors to change any of the ET information provided. It is clear that they do not and would not change any ET knowledge provided to them. What the ETs provided is deliberately unaltered by the channelers.

The authors Royal and Priest have organized the ET knowledge into a book. Chapter one of their book, *Visitors from Within*, contains the history of the Zeta Reticuli that is referred to by Farsight as part of the ET PsyOp. The reason for sharing this channeled history, maintain the authors, is:

---

[12] Royal & Keith, 1992, p. xi.
[13] I capitalize Earth since I consider it the name of our planet. The same is true for the Moon and the Sun.
[14] Royal & Keith, 1992, p. viii.
[15] Royal & Keith, 1992, p. xiv.
[16] Royal & Keith, 1992, p. xiii.
[17] Royal & Keith, 1992, p. xiv.

"They want to share their knowledge of what occurred in their past so that others will not need to recreate it"[18]. The Zetas provided this version of their history so that the Earth people or the public will learn from their mistake and not repeat it.

What is significant about publishing this history of the Zetas is that this is how Farsight and the public become aware of it. Without this dissemination we wouldn't know about it and read about the ET history lesson. As well, the authors make no judgment about the channeled information that the ETs have provided. They don't tell us if the ET knowledge is accurate or not. They're sharing the information that they've obtained which leads us to assume that they agree with this channeled information.

The authors' dissemination of the ET history is part of the ET PsyOp that Farsight dismisses. Farsight and others, like myself, become aware of the ET history and are thus related to it, especially when we refer to it and use it.

4) Farsight's Weakness in Using the PsyOp Concept

In this part of the analysis I want to show some problems that arise in Farsight's use of the PsyOp concept in response to the channeled history provided by the ET entities. First, here is a summary of Farsight's response to the history provided by a particular group of Zetas.

The Zeta Reticuli history provided by the channeled ETs, like Germane by Royal, was investigated by Farsight. What they discovered is presented around the 5:30 to the 6 minute timestamp:

> "From our own research done here at Farsight, using highly trained remote viewers working under completely blind conditions, we obtained multiple corroborating reports that indicated that the precursors of the Greys were not a species that destroyed their environment. In fact, they were fine with their environment. Rather, what really happened was that they were attacked and enslaved. A military force controlled by the same reptilians who currently run Earth as a prison planet attacked and conquered their very human-like civilization and essentially enslaved their entire population."

Farsight's research about the "Greys" reveals a very different history than the one channeled by Germane through Royal. They discovered that the ETs were conquered and enslaved by "Reptilians" and did not destroy their environment. As a consequence, Farsight does not trust these channeled ETs (Germane and Bashar) and accuses them of hidden motives and agendas. The Farsight presenter states, around the 8:07 timestamp, "one simply cannot trust them to take over and run things". They consider these entities as "experts at presenting themselves as angels" with "personalities and content" that always sounds nice (around the 14 minute timestamp).

There is a fundamental disagreement then between Farsight's research version and the channeled ET history. Farsight goes on to maintain that we can't trust these ETs and their content because they can portray themselves as angels even when they are deceiving us.

---

[18] Royal & Keith, 1992, p. 1.

The false ET history is explained by Farsight as being part of a PsyOp. Around the 7:30 to 7:38 minute timestamp, the Farsight presenter states: “So the story told by Bashar and Germane were just part of a PSYOP, a story told to cover up the real background of the groups who were doing terrible things to people here on Earth”. In other words, the reason for the ETs telling their version of their history to us was to hide the terrible things, like abductions, that they were doing to people on Earth. Their false history is part of a PsyOp because it covers up the awful things they were doing. That is, the ETs want us to focus on improving our environment instead of becoming aware of and figuring out how to counter the horrible things that they are doing to us. Farsight sees the false ET history as diverting us from the degrading things that they are doing to the general public.

There are a number of problems in considering how Farsight has applied their adopted concept[19] of a PsyOp to the channeled ET information. I’ve organized these into 3 parts starting with the use of PsyOp as a negative label.

a) The way in which Farsight uses the PsyOp concept is like a negative label that is applied to the channeled false ET history. That is, Farsight exposes the history as a cover story for the atrocities this particular group of ETs are committing given their research of the same history. They then simply assert that this deception is a PsyOp. That is not really applying the concept to their example.

To actually apply the PsyOp concept to their example, Farsight needs to show how the parts of the definition relate to their example. This would be a problem given the initial definition and the way that they expanded their interpretation to include anyone influencing the public. There is no clearly stated definition by Farsight that constitutes a PsyOp that they would then apply to their example. Applying PsyOp as a negative label actually prevents Farsight from showing us how the channeled history is a PsyOp.

b) Since Farsight does not provide us with a clear definition of what they consider a PsyOp, it isn't possible to tell what is and what is not a part of a PsyOp. This could be summed up as a problem of focus. Since Farsight begins its presentation as an inquiry into a PsyOp we expect that the original definition and its interpretation be consistent. This could be done in a reworded definition of PsyOp. Farsight does not do this. Without doing this, we do not know what the focus is of their inquiry. Their PsyOp definition would tell us what to focus on and subsequently what to ignore. Without this, the use of a concept when applied to an example has very limited or no focus.

An example from Farsight is that the channeled fake history by the ETs is just “part of a PSYOP”. If that is part of a PsyOp, then Farsight needs to tell us what are the remaining parts. However, Farsight isn’t able to do that since they do not provide a clear definition as to what constitutes a PsyOp. We do not know if the following comments are part of what Farsight would consider a PsyOp.

Around the 8:28 to 8:38 minute timestamp, the Farsight presenter states that the ET entities “ such as Bashar and Germane appear to have strong support organizations. They're obviously not

[19] The theoretical basis of my conceptual analysis here is from Smith, 2004.

working alone." We are not told if having a strong organization is part of Farsight's meaning of a PsyOp.

A bit later, from the 8:49 to about the 8:59 minute timestamp the presenter adds: "They obviously have tremendous training in sounding innocent and convincing, but in our view, based on our own research, they are not what they seem to be. They have an unspoken agenda." Here, too, we are not told if the ET training in "sounding innocent and convincing" is part of a PsyOp. Farsight stating that the ETs are "not what they seem to be" refers to an expectation that the ETs should be truthful and admit that they are lying. There is no mention of how this is part of a PsyOp. The last point here is that these ETs have an "unspoken agenda" which does not tell us if this is also part of a PsyOp.

As listeners, we should not have to infer whether any of the preceding are part of Farsight's definition and meaning of a PsyOp or not. Farsight still needs to provide this.

c) Lastly, Farsight uses the PsyOp concept as a method to separate itself from the ET PsyOp. The reference to distancing themselves from the ET PsyOps works as follows. It begins when the PsyOp concept is used to refer to an isolated instance or activity. Farsight expresses this separation at the 16:45 minute timestamp: "If we at Farsight were running their PSYOPs with all of their resources, that is exactly how we would run it." Farsight's statement clearly indicates that the ET channeled history is "their PSYOPs" that is being carried out "with all of their resources". The ET entities and organization are the ones conducting a PsyOp and not Farsight. This is reinforced when Farsight adds that if they were carrying out the ET PsyOp then that is how they would do it. The implication here is that this is an ET PsyOp and does not involve Farsight.

Farsight's method of using the ET PsyOp distances itself from these ET entities and organizations as it refers only to them. A consequence of this is that Farsight does not tell us whether or not their own debunking of this ET history is also a PsyOp. Based on their interpretative statement that "Farsight is a PSYOP" around the 40 second timestamp, this might be the case. How Farsight might come to be a PsyOp isn't presented. For the current point, it's possible that there might be two separate PsyOps, the ET one and the Farsight one. Farsight's method of using the ET PsyOp concept is as a distancing device where isolated activities are labelled as PsyOps. This method glosses over how PsyOps might be connected by examining the actual social conditions of these PsyOps. For example, Farsight exposing the ET channeled false history could simply be a rejoinder to and continuation of the ET one. Farsight's current practice of this concept doesn't facilitate that.

A Concluding Suggestion

When Farsight began their presentation with the concept of ET PsyOp, we anticipated that we would learn more about it, such as its historical context, and the way that they are interpreting it. We looked forward to their clearly stated meaning and how they planned to use it. This was not done in this presentation. We are left with the conclusion that there doesn't appear to be much consistency and follow through in the development of their chosen concept especially when they move beyond the original definition to include anyone and everyone engaging in a PsyOp who

seeks to change the public's opinion. Without a clear statement of what they meant by a PsyOp, a number of problems arose in how they applied this concept to their example of the ET channeled false history. Most notable here was the conceptual practice of the ET PsyOp concept to refer to isolated events as a PsyOp.

Should Farsight be interested in avoiding some of the problems inherent in adopting the concept of a PsyOp to analyse the ET organizations expressed as entities, I offer the following suggestion. My suggestion is simply that Farsight does not need to use the PsyOp concept. This concept just gets in the way of Farsight's research and results. Their presentations are far more interesting and important, such as investigating the supervisors and organization of the ET entities. That should be highlighted in what Farsight tells us. They really don't need an abstract concept to get in the way of the significant work that they are doing.

References

Airenti, G. 2019. The Place of Development in the History of Psychology and Cognitive Science. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 895. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00895

Curtis, Glen. 1989. "An Overview Of Psychological Operations (Psyop)." Available as a pdf from the Federal Research Division, Library of Congress: Washington, DC.

The Farsight Institute website: https://farsight.org/

Jeaneé, Yeme. 2025 Jan 24. "ET Psyop - Farsight (Trailer)." Farsight. *YouTube*: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Fb59oW2gXg

Military Information Support Operations Supplement To The Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan. 2011 Sep 30. Available at: https://info.publicintelligence.net/CJCS-MISO.pdf

Muller, Jake. 2024. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (M - Z) Vol 2*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Psychological Operations. 2021 Mar 1. Government of Canada website: https://www.canada.ca/en/army/corporate/5-canadian-division/5-canadian-division-influence-activities/psychological-operations.html

Psychological Warfare on Wikipedia website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychological_warfare

Royal, Lyssa & Priest, Keith. 1992. *Visitors from Within*. Phoenix, Arizona: Royal Priest Research Press. Available at: https://archive.org/details/visitorsfromwith00lyss/page/n1/mode/2up

Smith, Dorothy E. 2004. *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory and Investigations.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.